



**University of
Zurich**^{UZH}

**Zurich Open Repository and
Archive**

University of Zurich
University Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2016

“The Balkan Manner of Narration”: Narrative Functions of the l-Periphrasis in Pre-Standardized Balkan Slavic

Sonnenhauser, Barbara

Abstract: Research on the Balkan languages has concentrated mainly on phonological, morphosyntactic and lexical similarities on the one hand (for an overview, cf., e.g., Asenova 2002, Friedman 2006) and on the common tradition of folk songs on the other (e.g., Georges 1972, Friedman 2012). More recently, the discourse basis of certain Balkan features has been pointed out (e.g., Friedman 1994). Furthermore, structural analogies on the text level have become the focus of attention in, for example, Fielder’s (1999) analysis of Turkish-Bulgarian convergences in the usage of verbal categories for the structuring of narratives. Embedding morphosyntax in a textual perspective, Asenova (2002:296-97) assumes the similarity in the syntactic systems of the Balkan languages to be indicative of a similarity in the structure of their different “variants of the Balkan text.” D’omina (1970:418) notices a “Bulgarian manner of narration” for damaskini dating to the 17th and 18th century, which is visible in the usage patterns of renarrative and nonrenarrative forms. Focusing on the l-periphrasis in pre-standardized Balkan Slavic written documents, this article intends to arrive at a clearer picture of the “Balkan text” and the Balkan manner of narration. The data basis is provided by texts dating from the mid-17th to the early 19th century. This temporal delimitation is crucial for two reasons: On the one hand, later language planning may have excluded Balkan features from the standard languages and hence may have expelled them from the majority of written documents. On the other hand, the respective features are not displayed beyond random occurrences in older, predominantly Church Slavonic documents. Texts dating to the 17th-19th century can thus be assumed to reflect possible Balkan structures and usage patterns, which may have been lost in the course of standardizing linguistic structures and literary conventions.

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich
ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-113115>
Journal Article

Originally published at:

Sonnenhauser, Barbara (2016). “The Balkan Manner of Narration”: Narrative Functions of the l-Periphrasis in Pre-Standardized Balkan Slavic. *Balkanistica*, 29:175-216.

“The Balkan Manner of Narration”:
Narrative Functions of the *l*-Periphrasis in
Pre-Standardized Balkan Slavic¹

Barbara Sonnenhauser
University of Zürich

1. Introduction

Research on the Balkan languages has concentrated mainly on phonological, morphosyntactic and lexical similarities on the one hand (for an overview, *cf.*, *e.g.*, Asenova 2002, Friedman 2006) and on the common tradition of folk songs on the other (*e.g.*, Georges 1972, Friedman 2012). More recently, the discourse basis of certain Balkan features has been pointed out (*e.g.*, Friedman 1994). Furthermore, structural analogies on the text level have become the focus of attention in, for example, Fielder’s (1999) analysis of Turkish-Bulgarian convergences in the usage of verbal categories for the structuring of narratives. Embedding morphosyntax in a textual perspective, Asenova (2002:296-97) assumes the similarity in the syntactic systems of the Balkan languages to be indicative of a similarity in the structure of their different “variants of the Balkan text.” D’omina (1970:418) notices a “Bulgarian manner of narration” for *damaskini* dating to the 17th and 18th century, which is visible in the usage patterns of *renarrative* and *non-renarrative* forms.

Focusing on the *l*-periphrasis in pre-standardized Balkan Slavic written documents, this article intends to arrive at a clearer picture of the “Balkan text” and the Balkan manner of narration. The data basis is provided by texts dating from the mid-17th to the early 19th century. This temporal delimitation is crucial for two reasons: On the one hand, later language planning may have excluded Balkan features from the standard languages and hence may have expelled them from the majority of written documents. On the other hand, the respective features are not displayed beyond random occurrences in older, predominantly Church Slavonic documents. Texts dating to the 17th-19th century can thus be assumed to reflect possible Balkan structures and usage patterns, which may have been lost in the course of standardizing linguistic structures and literary conventions.

2. Development of the *l*-Periphrasis

Diachronically, the Slavic *l*-periphrasis – verbal constructions of *l*-participle plus the auxiliary ‘to be’ – has undergone changes in form, function and usage: the participle lost its restriction to non-durative verbal bases (see Sadnik 1966 and van Schoonefeld 1959 on Old Russian, Trost 1972 on OCS and Trummer 1971 on Middle Bulgarian), its function developed from stative to eventive (see Dickey 2013 on Old Czech), and its usage spread from dialogue and subordinate clauses to coherent narration (*cf.* Taube 1980 on Old Russian). Expressing the completion of durative events in the past, the perfect developed into a competitor of the aorist (Trost 1972:101). This paved the way for the eventual loss of the aorist in most Slavic languages. Dickey (2013) notes a correlation between the loss of the aorist and the loss of third-person auxiliaries, for which he sees a functional correlation in the usage of the former perfect in the narrative discourse mode.

For a specific period of time, thus, variation concerning the usage of the third-person auxiliary with the *l*-periphrasis can be observed for all Slavic languages. Over time, this variation has developed further, albeit in different ways:

- the omission of the auxiliary has spread to all other persons, *e.g.*, Russian;
- the auxiliary has been kept for all persons, *e.g.*, Slovene; and
- the auxiliary has been lost in the third-person but retained in the others, *e.g.*, Czech.

In Balkan Slavic, yet another kind of development can be observed: the presence or absence of the third-person auxiliary has become functionalized.² This functional relevance is maintained in contemporary standard Bulgarian, where the auxiliary variation is regarded as constitutive of different paradigms, such as perfect, conclusive, renarrative, etc. (Nicolova 2008). In contemporary standard Macedonian, the third-person auxiliary is always omitted. Contemporary standard Serbian has the auxiliary in all persons, but the omission of the third-person auxiliary can be found in the colloquial language (the “truncated perfect”; *cf.* Grickat 1954, Meermann 2015); its southern and eastern dialects resemble Bulgarian or Macedonian in this respect.³

Fielder (2002/2003) shows that the differences in the contemporary standard languages are not only conditioned by the choice of dialect base, but also by the *Balkanistica* 29 (2016)

time and circumstances of codification. This has consequences not only for the description of the contemporary situation (codified standard and its prescriptive norms vs. colloquial and dialectal varieties), but also for the analysis of pre-standardized varieties. Most importantly, this tells us not to judge historical and diachronic data from the perspective of the rules stated in grammars of contemporary standard Bulgarian, Macedonian or Serbian. Moreover, speaking of “Bulgarian,” “Macedonian” or “Serbian” for these earlier stages of language development may be reasonable considering phonological or morphological (mainly inflection) developments, which allow for a genetic classification. It is of less advantage, however, when it comes to the investigation of younger morpho-syntactic phenomena conditioned by the areal context. The notion Balkan Slavic is preferred also insofar as the literary development of the languages in question proceeded in a largely parallel way as, for example, Angelov (1964:16) emphasizes: *prez onova vreme može da se govori za obšto literaturno dviženie meždu bălgari i sārbi* ‘it is possible to talk about a common literary development among Bulgarians and Serbians during that time.’ Hill (1992:124) likewise assumes a joint history of linguistic and literary development up to the beginnings of standardization.

Previous studies on the usage of the *l*-periphrasis in pre-standardized Balkan Slavic have focused mainly on its morphological and semantic characteristics, as well as contexts of occurrence (*cf.* D’omina 1970 on 17th/18th-century *damaskini*; Ničeva 1965 and Vătov 2001 on Sofronij Vračanski; Cojnska 1979 on Joakim Kărčovski). Textual usage patterns and genre-specific conditions for the usage of these forms, which will be the focus of the present article, have not yet been discussed in detail (for short indications see, for example, Andrejčin 1968 and Rusinov 1999:81).

3. *l*-Periphrasis in the *Damaskini*

The first literary works written to a greater or lesser extent in what can be called Balkan Slavic date to the mid-16th century. These are translations of Damaskin Studit’s sermons from vernacular Greek into a “simple language” (as indicated by introductory phrases such as *Slovo bolgarskym ezykom* ‘homily in Bulgarian’ [Tixonravovski, 21v/64];⁴ and *spisano obščimъ jazykom* ‘written in common language’ [Svištovski, 503/259], the so-called “*damaskini*.” Over time, the vernacular has been gaining more ground in these texts. This was accompanied by

an increasing freedom in topics and content. Thereby, the texts developed from translations into narrations in their own right. They are thus considered to play a central role not only for the development of the respective literary languages but also for Balkan Slavic literary development in general (Petkanova-Toteva 1965). Having a look at the usage of the *l*-periphrasis in these documents therefore appears to be a good starting point in order to investigate the possible emergence and consolidation of the Balkan text and the Balkan manner of narration.

3.1. *l*-Periphrasis with Third-Person Auxiliary (“+aux Forms”)

Demina (1960:30) shows us that in 17th- and 18th-century damaskini, +aux forms are used predominantly in non-narrative contexts,⁵ *i.e.*, dialogues as in (1) and subordination as in (2):⁶

- (1) a. I dumaše. Koito *e imalъ* griža zadvētēmi dъštēry, toj šte ima griža i za tretiata (*Ljubljanski*, 78v/536).
‘And he said. Whoever *has taken* care of both daughters that one will take care also of the third one.’
- b. Iuda reče. azъ cъrce tova mēsto ne znaja, nito mi *e* nekoi *kazalъ*, ili ot stary naši oci nikoi ne mi *e pokazalъ* (*Koprištenski*, 485/200).
‘And Juda said. As for me, tsarina, I do not know this place, neither *has* anyone *told* me, nor *has* any of our priests *shown* [it] to me.’
- (2) a. [nikoj] ni sъs duma može iskaza da iznajde negovъ skopos. I čto *e storilъ* nebo i zemlju i more (*Trojanski*, 254/172).
‘and nobody is able with a word to express and encompass his power. And that he *has made* heaven and earth and the sea’
- b. darbi prinosetъ tomuva, deto *sъ e rodilъ* (*Svištovski*, 11/78).
‘they bring presents to the one who *is born*’

As can be seen, the *l*-periphrasis is formed also from verbs that do not imply a resultant state. Even though this opens up the possibility of these forms being used in coherent narration and convey a sequence of events, such examples are hard to find. The excerpt in (3), to which D'omina (1970:411) ascribes a “conclusive” interpretation, might at first sight be taken as instantiating this usage:

- (3) i da vĕruvašb ōče, kak' me utrĕpe moreto, ta se ne razigra da me potopi. [...] kato s'mb tol'kova duši otskvĕnila migarĕ bĕ e bylĕ mltivĕ, i [e] ožidalĕ da se pokaja. i nĕ e štĕlb bĕ sĕmrĕtb grĕšnomu čĭku, ami [e] čjakalĕ da se ōbrĕne na pokaanie (Tixonravovski, 169v/194; cf. also D'omina 1970:411; the insertions are hers).

‘and believe me, father, that the sea carried me, and it did not happen that it let me sink. And given that I desecrated so many souls, amazingly, God *was* merciful, and he *trusted* in me that I repent. And God *did not want* death for a sinful person, but *waited* that [this person] turns to repentance.’

However, although (3) shows a sequence of *l*-periphrases, no sequence of events in the sense of an evolving narration is conveyed. Instead of being temporally or causally related to each other, the denoted events are each individually related to the narrating instance. This is symptomatic of the +aux usage in these and later texts and confirms what Trummer (1971:54) observes for 14th-16th century texts: *Ein Gegenwartsbezug ist unabhängig von der Aktionsart des Verbums in jedem Fall sichtbar* ‘Reference to the present is apparent in any case, irrespective of the aktionsart of the verb.’ On the one hand, therefore, an extension of the perfect can be observed as regards the verbal basis, while on the other hand its usage remains restricted to non-narrative contexts. Both perfect and aorist may refer to single events in the past and thereby functionally converge in these instances. However, *Handlungsketten sind weiterhin dem Aorist vorbehalten* ‘sequences of events continue to be reserved for the aorist’ (Trummer 1971:63). This is also confirmed by Demina’s (1960:30) observation that the perfect is used *v nepovestvovatel’nyx kontekstax, v tom čisle pri soobščeenii ili voprose ob otdel’nom fakte prošlogo* ‘in non-narrative contexts, including reports and questions about a single fact in the past’ and *nikogda ne vystupaet v kačestve vremeni razvertyvajuščegosja povestvovanija* ‘it never serves as the tense of an evolving narration’ (*Ibid.*).

3.2. *l*-Periphrasis without Third-Person Auxiliary (“-aux Forms”)

Similar to the +aux forms, the *l*-forms without the third-person auxiliary are typically found in subordinate contexts as in (4a), and in dialogues as in (4b):

- (4) a. I taka se pom(o)li i naděše se na b(og)a, davno *vidělb*
Někogy togova čl(ově)ka (*Trojanski*, 262/177).
‘And so he prayed and hoped to God, that somebody
hopefully has ever *seen* that man.’
- b. I pakъ stana Rapsakie posrěďb těxb i reče visoko: tъj
povelělb carъ asirijsky Senaxerimъ da ne preľštava vasъ
Ezikia carъ (*Svištovski*, 357/205).
‘And Rapsakij stood up again among them and said in a
strong voice: such *has ordered* the Assyrian Tsar Senaxerim,
in order that Tsar Jezekija does not seduce you.’

These forms also appear – even though not too often – in coherent narration, as in (5a). (5b) shows an interplay of +aux and -aux forms: the +aux forms *sъ naučile* and [*sъ*] *utvrđdile* are used in a typical perfect sense, *i.e.*, as emphasizing the relevance of the denoted past events (teaching, confirming) to the current time of utterance, whereas the -aux forms *šťělb da umre* and *kazalb* report on a sequence of events not connected to the time of utterance (for more details, *cf. Section 5*):

- (5) a. ami oči naši zaradi tova mu zavidixa ta go raspexa i
pogrěboxa go, ami onъ vъ trětij dňb pakъ *stanalb* i *oživelb* i
voskřānalb i *javil* se na sičky. i po m̃ [40] dñi *vozněslb* se na
ñboto. ami moj oťb *imalb* brata, *zovale* go stefane,
arxidiakonъ *bylb* i *věruvalb* iīsa xřta. i *počelb* da uči ljudie da
věruvatъ iīsa xřta, a farisee *sa sьbrale* i *pobile* go sь kamenie
(*Koprištenski*, 483/199).
‘but our fathers envied him because of that and crucified
him, and buried him, but on the third day thereafter he *arose*
and *came back to life* and *appeared* to everybody. And after
40 days he *ascended* to heaven. But my father *had* a brother,

he *was called* Stefan, he *was* archdeacon and *believed* in Jesus Christ. And he *began* to teach people to believe in Jesus Christ and the Pharisee gathered and *beat* him with stones.'

- b. zašto ako kažete to šte da se razvali zakonъ ot oči naši předanie, sireč, što *sъ naučile* i *utvrđile*. žašto dědъ moi zakxei, koga *štělъ da umre*, i *kazalъ* oču moemu simonu (*Tixonravovski*, 23/65).

'because if you tell it the law of the tradition of our fathers will get ruined, that is, what they have learnt and decreed. Because my grandfather Zakxej, when he *was about* to die, *told* [it] my father Simon. And my father told me [this] and advised me.'

According to Demina (1970:418-19), the usage of "renarrative" and "non-renarrative" forms, *i.e.*, -aux forms and all other forms, in the *Tixonravovski* damaskin is regular insofar as non-renarrative forms are used for the story line, while renarrative forms mark deviations from it. Thus, -aux forms may relate the information conveyed to a foreign source. An example of the usage of these forms in deviations from the main story line is given in (6), where *byle* and *byl obyčalъ* provide characterizations but do not contribute to the advancement of the main story line.⁷ Importantly, "deviation from the story line" is not to be understood in terms of "unimportant" or "backgrounded" events.

- (6) i posluša gy carъ za taja дума, i pusti po sičky města, i po gradove i po sela, po dva čl(ově)ka da go ištъtъ. i dva voina što *byle* slugy s(vę)tomu eistatiju, i *byl gy obyčalъ*. imenata imъ, antioxъ i alakie. i tie poidoxa da go ištatъ [...] (*Trojanski*, 60/50).

'and the tsar heard this word, and sent [people] around all places, and cities and villages, two men in each case, to search for him. And two soldiers, who *were* footman of St. Eustathius, and he *loved* them, their names were Antiox and Alakie. And they went to search for him.'

D'omina (1970) observes a specific amount of variability in direct speech, where *sāzdatelite na bālgarskija tekst dopuskat značitelni kolebanija v razbiraneto na originala, otklonenija ot normite na živija ezik* 'the creators of the Bulgarian text allow for considerable indetermination concerning the comprehension of the original, deviations from the norms of the living language' (D'omina 1970:415). This can be seen in (7) where *pisanieto dumaše taka* introduces a direct speech containing -aux and present-tense forms. Since the usage of these forms cannot entirely be motivated by the above-mentioned pattern, D'omina (1970:416) regards them as a "deviation from the norms of the living language":

- (7) I pisanieto dumaše taka [...] i Theofilъ kato onia nepravedno čini [...]. egiptъsky stolъ *prielъ*, a nepravedno čini [...] i za[ra]di tova *sъbral se* съборъ съs еpskpy egyptъsky[...]. i plakaaxu za Sidora[...]. deto *go e mučilъ* Theofilъ съsěkakvy muky (*Tixonravovski*, 114v/146).
 'And the document said the following: and Theophil, he did this without legal cause, he *took over* the Egyptian throne, and did this without legal cause. And therefore a council *has gathered* with the Egyptian bishops. And they cried over Isidor, whom Thoeofil has tortured with all kinds of torment.'

Given that -aux forms have a rather short tradition in written texts at that time, the omission of the auxiliary might also be simply a slip of the pen by the translator or copyist and have no functional relevance at all. Moreover, diverging uses such as in (8), where the *Trojanski* and the *Koprištenski* damaskini exhibit the -aux forms *viděla*, *rekle* and *zarăčale*, while the 1788 version by Ioan ot Vraca has the aorists *vide* and *skazaxa* (no equivalent to *zarăčale*), might not necessarily have a functional explanation but may, for instance, be conditioned by the different origin of the copyist (see Mladenova 2007 on the issue of tracing differences in pre-standardized texts).

- (8) a. I prězъ tъja noštъ i druga žena [...] i tia takova *viděla*: i takviva dumy i nej *rekle*: i *zarăčale*. Skoro utrě rano da kažešъ tova (*Trojanski*, 109/81).

‘And in the course of that night, another women *had* such a *dream*: and they *told* her, too, such words: and they *commanded*. Tell this early in the morning’

- b. i prězъ tьzy noštъ i druga žena[...], i tia takvozy *viděla* i takvizy dumy i njei *rekle* i *zar’čale*, skoro utrě rano da kažešъ tova (*Koprištenski*, 23/10).

‘and in the course of that night another woman, too, *had* such a *dream* and they *told* her, too, such words and *commanded*, tell this early in the morning.’

- c. I taę noštъ i druga nekoę žena, [...] i ona takovo videnie *vide*. I egda *skazaxa*⁸ na epivatski ljudie, skoro priid(o)xa sās mnogu radostъ [...] (Joan ot Vrača 1788, cited in Angelov 1958:103).

‘And in that night another woman, too, *had* such a *dream*. And when they *told* [it] to the people of Epibati, they came with great joy.’

Overall, however, there is evidence that in the majority of cases the -aux forms were indeed used in a conscious and intentional way, which can also be given a functional motivation.

3.3. *Emerging Regularities*

D’omina’s (1970) analysis and the examples cited above indicate that +aux forms are not used as a narrative tense in these texts, whereas -aux forms certainly do appear in narrative contexts. This suggests that in the damaskini of the 17th and 18th century, the *l*-periphrasis did not (yet) function as a general past and that the role of the auxiliary consisted of anchoring some previous event to a present point in time (actual present in the case of dialogues; textual present in the case of subordination). Its omission allowed for the de-anchoring from the primary point of orientation and thereby opened up the possibility of these forms being used in a sequence of events (*cf.* also Dickey 2013). This possibility is also basic to the indication of events not belonging to the main story line, which D’omina (1970) regards as the preferred function of -aux forms.

What the data also show is that -aux forms do not code notions like renarrative or non-witnessed. Both are possible interpretations, triggered in specific contexts. An example is given in (9): *blagoslovilb* ‘he blessed’ in (9a) suggests a non-witnessed interpretation, as does *začela* ‘I conceived,’ which is one of the rare examples of first-person auxiliary omission. Here, the -aux forms can be interpreted as indicating Anna’s skepticism and astonishment. Similarly, the -aux forms *ižgnilo* and *prilēpila* in (9b) suggest that the brothers did not personally witness the events of the body burning and the clothes getting glued to it:

- (9) a. I kato iděše Ioakim posrěštna go anna i xvati se za šiat mu i reče. sega viděx oti me *blagoslovilb* gospodъ bogъ tvrdě, zašto běxъ kato vdovica, ami saga nēs’мъ vdovica, i bez’čedna běxъ, a sega *začela* čedo (*Koprištenski*, 170/71).
 ‘And when Ioakim came, Anna flung her arms around his neck and said: now I saw that God *has blessed* me, because I was a widow, but am no longer, I was childless, but now I *have conceived* a child.’
- b. i razgněva se igumenъ, i reče, na bratia. Sъblěčete go skoro da vidimъ otde ide tozi smradъ. i tie započexa da go sъblěkutъ i ne mogoxa, zašto *ižgnilo* mu těloto i *prilēpila* se rizata mu (*Tixonravovski*, 11r/54).
 ‘And the monk got angry and said to the friars: Take off his clothes so that we can see where this smell comes from. And they began to take off his clothes but they could not because his body *had burned up* and his shirt *was glued on*.’

A non-witnessed interpretation is also plausible for *bylo* in (10a). This becomes even more obvious with the presence of *e bilo* in the same context, which, by means of the auxiliary, establishes a relation to the speaker’s time of utterance. A non-witnessed interpretation is likely for *izvelb* in (10b), the primary narration of which is ascribed to *našite bьšty*. In (10c), the -aux forms indicate that the events described as having happened to the grandfather are known to the speaker not from personal witnessing. This is obviously different for the aorists *kaza* and *sarača*. *Balkanistica* 29 (2016)

Here, the speaker describes what his own father has told him – he must have personally been a witness:

- (10) a. Juda reče: carice, lětopisecъ kniga kazuva, ot kogi *bylo* tuva. Ima do dvěstě godiny i po mnogo, a nie sme maldy, i kak' štemъ da znaemъ togozy što *e bylo* (*Svištovski*, 593/289).
'Juda said: Tsaritsa, the chronicle says when this *happened*. It was two hundred years or more ago, but we are young, and how shall we know how it *was* back then?'
- b. sъs mene li e gospodъ? [...] gde sa togovite velikyčjudesa, štoto ny kazvaxa našite bъšty, i kakъ gy *izvelъ* bogъ iz Egipetъ (*Svištovski*, 348/201-202).
'are you with me, Lord? Where are those great miracles our fathers have told us about, and how god *led* them out of Egypt?'
- c. žašto dědъ moi zakxei, koga *štělъ* da umre, i *kazalъ* oču moemu simonu. i moi očъ simonъ, kaza mene i zarača mi. i reče (*Tixonravovski*, 23r/65).
'because my grandfather Zakxej, when he *was about* to die, *told* [it] my father Simon. And my father told me [this] and advised me.'

D'omina (1970:418-19) takes the emerging regularity in the usage of (non)renarrated forms in the damaskini as the basis of the Bulgarian (and, more generally, Balkan Slavic) archetype manner of narration:⁹ *upotrebata na [preizkazni formi] v Tixonr[avovski] v avtorskija tekst može da bāde izcjalo objasnena s izbranija ot sāzdatelite na bālgarskija arxetip manier na povestvovanie* 'the usage of renarrated forms in the *Tixonravovski* damaskin in the author's text can be completely explained in terms of the scribes' choice of the Bulgarian archetype manner of narraton.'

In the following, I will investigate to what extent these regularities are also characteristic of the further development of literary Balkan Slavic as encountered in vernacular narration dating from the late 18th to early 19th centuries and what this might tell us about the Balkan text.

4. *-aux in 18th-19th Century Vernacular Narration*

In order to look at the possible further consolidation of the usage patterns of the *-aux* forms, excerpts from vernacular narrative texts dating from the late 18th to early 19th century will be compared according to three criteria: time, author and subject matter. These criteria have been chosen assuming that they might all motivate the usage of renarrative forms and serve as an explanation for possible divergences across texts:

- *time* is a factor to be considered since the increasing usage of *-aux* forms in written texts is a rather young phenomenon and its textual usage is still in the process of consolidation at the time in question;
- *author* may be relevant given the different dialectal backgrounds and given the increase in individuality in these texts, which may be reflected in author-specific uses of the forms in question; and
- *subject matter* and *type of story* may influence the choice of forms, especially judging from the point of view of the contemporary standard which regards *-aux* forms as typical of legendary texts and fairy tales.

Comparing texts according to these criteria, we assume, will reveal correlations between time, author, subject matter and the usage/non-usage of *-aux* forms. Should there be no correlations detected, the usage of these forms may indeed be simply arbitrary or be motivated by functional reasons different from and independent of these criteria.

The three factors produce eight possible combinations of values, listed in *Table 1*. Not all of the combinations are suitable and relevant for the present purposes. The combination of different time and same author is excluded, since the life span of one author (more precisely, the time of his being active in writing) might not be long enough to reflect effects of language change, linguistic change or changes in textual conventions. This rules out combinations 2 and 4. If all criteria are different, the comparison is too general to yield any meaningful results, which rules out combination 1. The same holds for combination 6, *i.e.*, identity in time but different author and different story. This leaves four possible combinations – 3, 5, 7 and 8 – to be considered:

Balkanistica 29 (2016)

	Time	Author	Story	Comment
1	≠	≠	≠	too general to be considered
2	≠	=	=	one author's time span of writing too short to yield reasonable results
3	≠	≠	=	tests the relevance of time for the usage of \pm aux forms; <i>cf. Section 4.1</i>
4	≠	=	≠	one author's time span of writing too short to yield reasonable results
5	=	≠	=	tests the relevance of author for the usage of \pm aux forms; <i>cf. Section 4.2</i>
6	=	≠	≠	too general to be considered
7	=	=	≠	tests the relevance of story for the usage of \pm aux forms; <i>cf. Section 4.3</i>
8	=	=	=	tests the general consistency in the usage of \pm aux forms; <i>cf. Section 4.4</i>

Table 1

Excerpts from the following texts will be analyzed (*Figure 1* indicates their provenance): the *Rožvedstvo Xrístovo* from the *Svištovski* damaskin (1753), Sofronij Vračanski's *Poučitelno evangelie* (PE) (1806)¹⁰ with texts stemming from the *evangelie* part and texts from the corresponding *tălkuvanija* 'interpretations' and *poučenijsa* 'instructions,' his *Žitie* (1806) and various texts from Pop Punčo's *Sbornik* (1796). Since these texts are not transcripts of each other but individually composed,¹¹ differences may indeed be functionally conditioned. Importantly, the following comparison focuses on differences; this is not meant to imply that there are no correspondences to be found. Moreover, the excerpts are representative examples and not an exhaustive list of evidence.



Figure 1:

Provenances of Authors and Texts

[P = Pop Punčo, S = Sofronij Vračanski, SD = *Svištovski damaskin*]

4.1. Different Time, Different Authors, Same Story

In order to investigate a possible continuity of the regularities found in the damaskini and later vernacular writing, excerpts from both kinds of texts are compared. Both describe the birth of Christ: *O roždestve Xristově* from the *Svištovski damaskin* in (11), dating to 1753, and the corresponding excerpt from the Gospel of Matthew for the 25th of December in the *PE* (12), dating to 1806. Both texts deal with one and the same subject matter but are written by different scribes or authors and have different times of origin. The discrepancy is visible at first glance: Whereas in the *Svištovski damaskin* aorist forms are used for the main story line, -aux forms predominate in the corresponding excerpt from the *PE*:

- (11) V dnite Iroda, carja iudejskago, *dodoxa* tri filosofoe ot istok na Jerosalimъ i *popitaxa*, gde e carъ iudejsky, deto sъ e rodilъ, oti mu viděxme dzvězd'ta na istokъ, i dodoxme da mu sa poklonimъ. I kato čju tuj Irodъ, *uboě sa tvrđdě i zova* arxiereite i knižnici i *popita* gi, gde kažetъ knigite či šte se da rodi Xristos. A tie mu *rekoxa*, oti prorokъ Mixej kaže na Vethleemъ šte da sa rodi. Togazi Irodъ skritomъ *zova* filosofite i *reče* imъ: iděte i pokloněte mu sa [...] (*Svištovski*, 16-17/79f).

‘In the days of Herod, the Jewish king, three philosophers from the east *came* to Jerusalem and *asked*, where is the Jewish king, who is born, because we saw his star in the east and came to

worship him. And when Herod *heard* this, he *was* heavily *terrified* and *called* the wise men and *asked* them, where, according to the books, Christ will be born. And they *told* him, that the prophet Micah said he will be born in Bethlehem. Then Herod secretly *called* the philosophers and *told* them.’

- (12) Kato *sę* *rodilъ* Iisusъ vo Vitleemъ Iudejskij, vo vremeto na carę Iroda, *došle* volsvitě otъ vostokъ vo Ierusalimъ, i *pytali*: gđe sę rodi carъ Iudejskij? Zaštoto nye mu viděxme zvezdata na vostokъ, i dodoxme da mu sę poklonime. A Irodъ kato *čulъ smutilse*. I kato *sъbralъ* sičkitě učeny čelověxy, *pytalъ* gi gđe šte sę rodi Xristosъ? A tě mu *kazali* vo Viteema Iudejskij: zaštoto taka e pisano otъ prorocytě. Poslě Irodъ kato *povikalъ* volsvytě tajno, i gi *ispytalъ* zaradi vremeto na ėvlennata svězda, *rekalъ* imъ: idete go namerete [...] (PE, 8).

‘When Jesus *was born* in Bethlehem of Judea, during the time of King Herod, three men from the east *came* to Jerusalem and *asked*: where is the king of the Jews born? Because we saw his star in the east and came in order to worship him. And when Herod *heard* this, he *became worried*. And when he *gathered* all wise men, he *asked* them, where will Christ be born? And they *told* him in Bethlehem in Judea: because this is written by the prophets. After that, when Herod secretly *called* the philosophers and *asked* them about the time when the star has appeared, he *told* them: go and find him.’

The difference in verb forms chosen for the story line is even more striking as the verbs are almost identical in their lexical content: *dodoxa–došle*, *popitaxa–pytali*, *čju–čulъ*, *uboę sa–smutilse*, *zova–sъbralъ*, *popita–pytalъ*, *rekoxa–kazali*, *zova–povikalъ*, *reče–rekalъ*. The choice of forms in the *Svištovski* damaskin conforms to the conditions given by D’omina, namely that aorist forms are used for events from the main story line. The usage of -aux forms in the *PE* contradicts this pattern.

It could thus very well be the difference in time and the accompanying difference in the stage of diachronic development that account for the divergences. If so, texts dating to the same time should not exhibit such fundamental differences. This will be investigated in the following section.

4.2. Same Time, Different Author, Same Story

The excerpts from Sofronij Vračanski's *Nedelnik* and Pop Punčo's *Sbornik* in (13) and (14), which both tell the *Vāzdiganieto na čestnyi krāstъ*, illustrate that one and the same story may be presented using different verbal categories: -aux in the *Nedelnik* and aorist in the *Sbornik*. This difference is found not only in the excerpts presented here but characterizes both texts in general.

- (13) Togiva Velikij Konstantinъ so slavnāę pobēda *vlēzel* vъ Rymъ, i vsi graždany *posrēšnali* ego čestno s golēmaę radostъ. Tako i onъ golēmoe Bļgodarenie *vozdal* Bģu, što *podarilъ* emu silu ta *pobēdilъ* togo mučitelę [...]. Poslē Cřъ Konstantin *poznal* věru Xřestianskuju i *krestilse* samъ, i Mati ego Elena. i vsi bolęry i vsi ljudie narym *stanali* Xřstiany, i togiva *bylo* golēmaę radost, i golēmoe toržestvo u Rym Grada [...].¹² Togiva Cřъ Konstatntinъ, *pratilъ* Mřъ svoju Cřicu Elenu vъ Ierusalimъ smnogoe imēnie da vzyšti Čestnago Křsta Gospodņę [...]
(*Nedelnik*, 179v-180r).

‘At that time, Konstantin the Great *entered* Rome with a glorious victory, and all citizens *met* him with great joy. And he *expressed* his gratitude to God that he *had given* him the strength and *won* over this tormenter. After that, Tsar Konstantin *accepted* the Christian faith, and *baptized* himself, and his mother Elena. And all boyars and all people of Rome *became* Christians, and then there *was* great joy and a big celebration in the city of Rome. Then Tsar Konstantin *sent* his mother Tsaritsa Elena to Jerusalem to obtain the true cross.’

- (14) Kostandinъ *nadvī* i *uleze* u rimъ grad i *srečnaxugo* ljudie rimlēne sasъ rados golemu i onъ veliko bļgodareše · bģa čemu *dade* bģъ silu ta *pobedi* mučitelja Maksentiju i potomъ *krestise* samъ i mati negova Elena i posle cřъ Kostandinъ *zaprati* mřъ svoju · Elenu vo Ieřlimъ da traži čtni křsteve ot nevernici i *dade* i cřъ mnogo imenie i *otide* cřca i *vide* onija sťi mesta i što imaše

čt̃ni mošti onagi našt̃ь *proizvede* i poč̃e da traži česni křst̃ь [...] (*Sbornik*, 164v-165r).

‘Konstantin *prevailed* and *entered* the city of Rome and the Roman people *met* him with great joy and he *thanked* God very much, for that he *gave* him the strength and *defeated* the tantalizer Maxentius. And after that he *baptized* himself and his mother Elena and after that Konstantin *sent* his mother Elena to Jerusalem in order to search for the true cross from the heathens and the tsar *gave* her a fortune. And the Tsaritsa *went* and *saw* the holy places and that there were true relics. She *unearthed* them and *began* to search the true cross.’

The comparison of (13) and (14) may be taken as an indication that the usage of the forms is dependent on the author, such as, for instance, his dialectal background or personal preferences. This will be examined in the next section, looking at texts dating to the same time, written by the same author, telling different stories. In order to test whether possible patterns are author-specific or whether they hold across authors, this will be done for two authors.

4.3. *Same Time, Same Author, Different Stories*

In this section, excerpts from Sofronij Vračanski’s *PE* and his *Žitie*, as well as different texts from Pop Punčo’s *Sbornik*, will be compared.

4.3.1. *Sbornik*: istorija vs. povest̃ь vs. *Insertion*

The first excerpts to be compared are taken from Pop Punčo’s *Sbornik* (1796): the *Sbbranie istoričeskoe o narode i o care bolgarstem* ‘historical collection about the Bulgarian people and the tsar’ (which is a shortened and slightly adapted rewriting of Paisij’s *Istorija*), the *Povest̃ь radi ča Aleksan’driju* ‘Narration concerning Tsar Aleksander,’ one of the narrations included in the anthology, and one of the inserted passages in which Pop Punčo introduces himself.

In the *istorija*, -aux forms prevail; cf. (15):

- (15) Posle po anastasija cřa *nastanul* sultan Sulimanъ turski i toj poide sasъ silna voiska i *zasedli* cři gradъ za tri leta i tako ot gladi *izmreli* · i ipo more *izbegli* i pomorese *izdavili* i tako tri xiljadi člveci *poginuli* paki tri velia kralъ blъgarski *sъbral* vojska silna i *pošъlъ* · na pomošť xristianomъ i *napadnulъ* na turci krepko i *ubilъ* ѿ nixъ · kъ [22] · xiljadi i *otkaralъ* · vъsa sila i turska ot cři gradъ toja tri velia kralъ pъvo *uzel* veru xristiansku i *pokrstilse* [...] (*Sbornik*, 339v-340r).

‘After Tsar Anastasije the Turkish Sultan Süleyman *appeared* and he came with a mighty army and *occupied* Tsarigrad for three years and they *died* of hunger. And they *fled* across the sea and they *surrendered* on the sea and three thousand people *died*. Again the great Bulgarian king *gathered* an army and *came* to the Christians’ aid and *attacked* the Turks heavily and *killed* 22 thousand of them and *expelled* the Turkish forces from Tsarigrad. This great king first of all *adopted* the Christian faith and *baptized* himself.’

In the *Povest’ radi ča Aleksan’driju*, aorist and imperfect forms are used almost exclusively; cf. (16):

- (16) Toj črъ Aleksan’drja, kogi *dignu* vojsku da se bie sasъ grъci i *bise* za mnogo vreme, i kogi *izleze* ot’ dom’ svoj i *otide* na vojsku i ne *vrъnu se* vъ domъ svoi četiridesetъ leta. Sve *xodi* i *bieše* se neprestano. I kade *udareše*, sasъ božiemъ poveleniemъ sve e *nadvivalъ*, i nikakvo ne *prestajaše* ot’ boj, sve *bieše* voin’stvo. I *vidoxu* slugi negovi, što mu beše xlebarъ i axčia i vinočerpatelъ. I *dogovornixu* se trojcata da otrovatъ čra Aleksan’driju [...] (*Sbornik*; cited in Angelov 1958:106).

‘This Tsar Aleksander *raised* his army to combat the Greeks and he *battled* for a long time, and he *left* his home and *went* to war and he did not *return* to his home for 40 years. He *was* constantly on the move and *fought* continuously. And where he *was fighting*, he constantly won relying on a divine order, and he did not at all *stop* fighting, he *campaigned* permanently. And

his slaves *saw* that he had a baker and a cook and a tavern keeper. And the three *agreed* on poisoning Tsar Aleksander.’

Aorist forms also dominate in the self-introductory passages in the *Sbornik*, as in (17):

- (17) азъ popa puno ot selo mokrešъ *napisaxъ* siju istoriju izvestno radi kralove i cřove kako suse bili blъgare i grъci · i posle *otъvnaxu* turci carstvo blъgarskoe [...] i азъ [...] *spisaxъ* siju istoricu slaveno bolgarъskoju i drugi mnogi skazanija i čudesa [...] · *proizvedoxъ* [...] i *napisaxъ* sia slovesa въ obidno selo mokrešъ [...] (*Sbornik*, 354r-354v).

‘I, Pop Punčo from the village Mokreš *have written* this history concerning the kings and tsars and how the Bulgars and Greeks *fought* and afterwards the Turks *vanquished* the Bulgarian empire. And I *wrote* this Slavic-Bulgarian history and many other stories and wonders. I *translated* and *wrote* these stories in the village Mokreš.’

The usage of -aux forms in (16), an excerpt from Paisij Xilendarski’s *Istorija*, is regarded as an indication of its vernacular basis (Rusinov 1999:76). At first sight, this seems to be confirmed by Pop Punčo’s usage of these forms as well. However, his language is deliberately and almost coherently vernacular, contrary to Paisij’s.¹³ Nonetheless, he uses aorist and imperfect forms as well. Hence, vernacularity alone cannot be the only reason for the usage of -aux. Assuming that the legendary and mythological content of the *Istorija* triggers the usage of these forms seems plausible given the usage of aorists in the self-introductory passages of (17). However, the story about Tsar Aleksander in (16) is as “historical” as the *Istorija*, yet aorist and imperfect forms are used.

4.3.2. Sofronij Vračanski: *PE* vs. *Žitie*

In order to rule out the possibility of idiosyncrasy, excerpts from Sofronij Vračanski’s *PE* and his *Žitie* will be compared. The excerpt in (18) is taken from the *PE* (*Neděle predъ roždestvo Xristovo*). It serves as an introduction, describing and explaining the background to the composition of the gospels. What can be

observed here is the usage of mainly -aux forms, with the insertion of a sequence of aorists (underlined) when it comes to describing the motivation for Matthew to arrange his gospel exactly the way he did:

(18) Рървото Evangelie *ispisalъ* Mathei 8 godiny podirъ voznesenieto Xristovo, vtoroto *ispisalъ* Marko 10 godiny slēdъ Xrista [...]. Mathej kato *ispisalъ* рървото evangelie, (*načnqlъ*) rodosloviето xristovo отъ Авраама і Davida: Zašto Evreitě *obyčali* da razuměetъ kakъ sę e rodilъ Xristosъ отъ roda Авраамонъ і Davidонъ. Za tova Mathej *isčislilъ* (*pričelъ*) sičkitě rodove [...] і go *narekalъ* synъ Davidонъ і Авраамонъ, za da sę radvatъ Evreitě [...] Za tova і Mathej načnava отъ těxъ і kazva: Kniga rodstva na Iisusa Xrista [...]. Iisusъ šte reče spasitelъ, a Xristosъ pomazanъ: zaštoto. Evreitě imaxa vъ edinъ rogъ maslo. I koga postavexa carъ ili svęštenikъ pomazvaxa go отъ tova maslo, і go *naričali* pomazanъ. za tova і Iisusъ sę *narekalъ* Xristosъ (pomazanъ:) zašto *bylъ* pomazanъ отъ Boga і za carъ і za svęštenikъ, kakto *ispylnil* і dvětě: sirěčъ: і smьrtъta kakto carъ *povēdilъ*, і sebe si *prinesalъ* žertva za nasъ kakto svęštenikъ. [...] (PE, 1-2).

‘Matthew *wrote* the first Gospel 8 years after the resurrection of Christ, Mark *wrote* the second 10 years after Christ. When Matthew *wrote* the first gospel, he *began* the family tree of Christ from Abraham and David. Because the Jews *wanted* to understand how Christ was born from the house of Abraham and David. Because of that Matthew *counted* all houses and he *called* him the son of David and Abraham, so that the Jews rejoiced. Therefore Matthew starts from them and says: Book of Jesus Christ’s birth. Jesus will be called the savior, and Christ is anointed: Because: The Jews had oil in a pot. And when they installed a tsar or priest they anointed him with that ointment, and called him anointed. Therefore, Jesus *was* also *called* Christ (anointed): Because he *was* anointed by God both as tsar and priest, because he *fulfilled* both: that is: he *died* like a king, and *gave* himself as sacrifice for us as a priest.’

A similar distribution is found in (19), an excerpt taken from the same context. The story line is rendered by -aux forms (in italics), with the insertion of a sequence of aorists (underlined):

(19) Сѣ вѣра і січкітѣ мѡченіцы *тѣрпѣли і полуčili* carstvoto nebesno, kakto kazva apostolѣ Pavelѣ: січки тѣ свѣтіі сѣ вѣра: carstva pobėdixa, pravda napravixa, obėštanie polučixa, Aslanski usta zatvorixa, ognenna sila ugasixa, [...], otѣ slaby *stanali* krėpki (ėki), [...], čuzditė polkove na bėgѣ *obėrnali*. mѣrtvy *voskrėsili*, і січкітѣ сѣ вѣра *umreli* [...] Заšto, kojto ima вѣра тој ima і надежда [...] (PE, 3).

‘With their faith in God all the martyrs *endured* and *received* the heavenly kingdom, as apostle Paul said: all the saints with faith: they gained the kingdom, they made the truth, they received a promise, they closed the lion’s mouth, they extinguished the strength of the fire, they *turned* from weak to strong, they *turned* around foreign regiments, they *raised* the dead, and all of them died with faith in God. Because he who has faith, has hope as well.’

In both (18) and (19), the -aux forms seem to function as the main narrative tense, while the aorist is inserted in specific passages. This is different in Sofronij’s autobiography, where the main narrative tense is the aorist, with -aux forms being inserted in particular passages. Two examples of such passages are given in (20):

(20) a. I kato *poišle* do Fandaklii *svadili* sę tamo pomeжду si ovčarete і *ubili* ednogo ot nixѣ. *fatil* gi tamošnia sultan і *položil* gi u zatvorka, і onyę ovcy *usvoilѣ*. po tię dni *iz’išelѣ bylѣ* ot Andrianpoly bostanči baši da pazi klisuryte da ne bėgaty turcy ot voiskat[a], і *predalѣ* sultanu onyę zatvornicy na bostanči baši, a nyi ot tova nikoę vęstѣ ne imaxmi (Žitie, 33-34).

‘And when they *came* to Fandaklii the shepherds *argued* there among themselves and *killed* one of them. The local sultan *seized* them and *put* them into jail, and *appropriated* their sheep. Those days the chief executioners *had come* from Andrianopol to watch the gorges, so that no Turks fled from the army, and the sultan *surrendered* those captives to the bostanci baši, and we did not have any information about this.’

b. slědъ tri dni razbraхъ, kako *gonil* sultan oċa eę da go ubii, a onъ *poběgal*, i *ufatilъ* brata eę i *bil* go mnogo i *uglubilъ* go: i azъ togiva uboęxse i priidoх въ usumnenie golēmoe (*Žitie*, 36).

‘After three days I learned that the Sultan *persecuted* her father in order to kill him, and he [the father] *fled*, and he [the sultan] *seized* her brother and *hit* him a lot and *beat* him *up*: and then I become frightened and strong doubts came over me.’

In (18) and (19), the -aux forms belong to what might be called the “author’s text” whereas the aorist is used in a different way, as in the presentation of what might intuitively be called “objective” facts and in direct speech. In (20), however, both the aorist/imperfect and the -aux forms appear within the author’s text. Encountering examples such as (18) and (19) on the one hand, and (20) on the other, it seems obvious that it is not possible to regard one specific form – aorist/imperfect or -aux forms – as “narrative tense” *per se*. What seems to be more decisive is the variation between aorist/imperfect and -aux.

Obviously, thus, the differences in usage of -aux forms and other forms cannot be accounted for in terms of preferences of individual authors, nor do they seem to hinge on the subject matter of the text. Even worse, variation can also be found if all possible factors are kept stable, as will be shown in the following section.

4.4. *Same Time, Same Author, Same Story: Sofronij Vračanski, PE*

That the usage of -aux and aorist forms is not necessarily author-specific in the sense of either one being typical for one particular author can be seen from the fact that the *Vāzdiganieto na čestnyi krāstъ*, for which Sofronij uses -aux forms in the *Nedelnik* – cf. (13), above – is rendered with aorist forms mainly in his *PE*; cf. (21):

- (21) A carъ Konstantinъ so slavnô pobědô *vlezna* vъ Rimъ, gděto go *posrešnaxa* sičkitě graždany sъ golěmô čestъ i radostъ. Toga carъ Konstantinъ kato vъzdade blagodarenie na Boga, za pobědôto si, *pozna* xristianskôto věrô i *sę krъšta* vъ Rimъ, sъ majkô si Elena, poslē *sę krъštaxa* sičkitě bolevi i sičkite rimski žiteli *prięxa* xristianskôto věrô. Toga *stana* golěmô radostъ vъ sičkie Rimъ i po okolnýtě strany, a carъ [...] *turi* krъstъ vъ sredôto na Rimъ, vъrxu edinъ golěmъ direkъ kamenъ, [...] Otъ tamô kato *sę vъrna* vъ Carigradъ, *provodi* majka si Elena vo Ierusalimъ [...] (PE, 269-70).

‘With a glorious victory, Tsar Konstantin *entered* Rome, where he *was met* by all citizens with great honor and joy. Then Tsar Konstantin thanked God for his victory, *adopted* the Christian faith and got *baptized* in Rome with his Mother Elena, afterwards all boyars *got baptized* and all inhabitants of Rome *adopted* the Christian faith. Then great joy *arose* all over Rome and in neighboring countries, and Tsar Konstantin *put* a cross in the center of Rome, on a big pillar. When he *returned* from there to Tsarigrad, he accompanied his mother Elena to Jerusalem.’

While this might be accounted for in terms of *PE* and *Nedelnik* being two different types of anthologies – which in turn raises the question on the relevant difference between both – such discrepancies can be found even within one and the same anthology. One example is the birth of Christ as described in the *Evangelie* and in the corresponding *Tălkovanie* from *PE*: Whereas the *Evangelie* uses aorist and imperfect forms – cf. (22) – the *Tălkovanie* makes use of -aux forms for the same events; cf. (23):

- (22) Vo onova vreme *dojde* pri Isusa edinъ junôša, *klaněšemuse* i *kazvaše*: učitelju dobryj, kakvo dobro da napravę, za da poluča životъ věčnij? A Iisusъ mu *reče*: zašto ma naričašъ dobrъ, nikoj ne e dobrъ, samo edinъ Bogъ: no ako iskašъ da polučišъ carstvo nebesnoe, upazi zapověditě: a toj *reče*: koi? Toga Iisusъ *kaza*: [...]. A junôšata *reče* tyę sičkitě sôm napravilъ[...]. Toga mu *reče* Iisusъ, aki iskašъ da bōdešъ sъveršenъ, idi si prodaj

Balkanistica 29 (2016)

sičkoto i go razdaj po siromasytě, i vŕvi podirŕ mene, ako iskašŕ da imašŕ bogatstvo na neboto. A junošata *si otidi* skorbennŕ: zaštoto imaše mnogo bogatstvo. Toga *reče* Iisusŕ na apostolytě: [...] (PE, 136).

‘At that time, a young man *came* to Jesus, *bowed* and *said*: good teacher, what good shall I do in order to obtain the eternal live? And Jesus *told* him: why do you call me good, nobody is good except for the only God: but if you want to obtain the Kingdom of Heaven, observe the commandments: and he *said*: which? Then Jesus *said* [...]. And the young man *said*, I have obeyed all of them. Then Jesus *told* him, if you want to be perfect, go and sell everything and distribute it among the poor, and follow me, if you want to have wealth in heaven. And the young men *went away*, sadly: because he had a lot of wealth. Then Jesus *said* to the apostles:’

- (23) Tozi junoša ne *došelŕ* da ispitva Xrista sŕ lukavstvo, no *želaelŕ* da sŕ nauči kakŕ može de vlězne vŕ carstvo nebesnoe. I *ne znaelŕ* Xrista kakŕ e Bogŕ, no *myslilŕ* da e čelověkŕ učitelŕ, za tuj i Xristosŕ mu *rekalŕ*: zašto ma naričašŕ dobrŕ? Estestveno nikoj ne e dobrŕ, tŕkmo edinŕ Bogŕ. A čelověcytŕ mogŕtŕ da bŕdatŕ dobri samo sporedŕ boŕiŕetŕ blagodatŕ. Tozi junoša kato *popitalŕ* Xrista kakvo da pravi, za da poluči carstvo nebesnoe, Xristosŕ go *provodilŕ* tutaksi na boŕiŕjtŕ zapovědi. [...] I kato *rekalŕ* junošata, či sičkitŕ zapovědi isprŕnilŕ, toga Xristosŕ mu *kazalŕ*: ty *si gi isprŕnilŕ* Iudejski, licemerno [...] no ako iskašŕ da bŕdešŕ sŕveršenŕ isprŕni gi isitinno. Tozi junoša *bylŕ* mnogo bogatŕ, a okolo nego *imalo* tolko siromasi, ako bŕše obyčalŕ komšiiŕtŕ si kato sebe si kakto kazva zakona, šteše da imŕ dade otŕ svoeto imanie, i neštexa da bŕdŕtŕ otŕ nego po dolni. Kakvoto pravime i nie sega, [...]? (PE, 137).

‘This young man did not *come* to ask Christ with deceit, but *wanted* to learn how he could enter the Kingdom of Heaven. And he *did not know* that Christ was God, but *thought* that he was a teacher, and that is why Christ *told* him: why do you call me good? Indeed, nobody is good, only God. And men can be

good only with the mercy of God. And when this young man *asked* Christ what he should do in order to obtain the Kingdom of Heaven, Christ at once *guided* him through the divine commandments. And as the young man *said* that he had obeyed all commandments, Christ *told* him: you have fulfilled them only hypocritically, but if you want to become perfect, fulfill them honestly. This young man *was* very rich, and there *were* only poor people around him, if he had loved his neighbors as much as himself, as the commandment says, he would have given them his wealth, and would not have wanted them to be inferior. And how are we performing these days?’

Here we have the same scriptural text, written at the same time by the same author, but aorist/imperfect is used in the one case and -aux in the other. Is this mere randomness, subject to the author’s mood, or perhaps conditioned by some factor that has not been considered so far? The first hints can be found in (23) in *kakvoto pravime i nie sega*, by which the narrator manifests himself in the text, and in (19), where *zašto, kojto ima vĕra toj ima i nadĕžda* may also be taken as an indication of a narrator appearing in the text, addressing the audience.

5. Arbitrariness or Intention?

The comparison of parallel texts in *Sections 4.1 to 4.4* has shown us that neither time of writing nor differences in authorship, or the subject matter appear to be determining factors for the choice of aorist/imperfect or -aux forms. Moreover, there is no strict correlation between main story line indicated by aorist/imperfect and deviations being marked by renarrative forms. Additionally, renarration does not seem to be the prime function of -aux forms, even though they may be interpreted this way in specific contexts. In the texts compared, the usage of -aux forms thus seems incoherent at first sight, different from what might have been predicted from Demina’s (1970) observations concerning 17th-18th century texts. This impression of inconsistency is also reflected in linguistic descriptions of the language of that time. Moser (1972:44) regards Sofronij Vračanski’s *Žitie* as “diffuse and rambling and written in a very unsettled language,” conceding, at least, that this “was not the author’s fault, as he had only the chaotic language of his time with which to work.” It remains to be questioned, however, what

“chaotic” means in this case, how the degree of “chaotic-ness” could be measured and what might serve as a standard of comparison. Obviously, “chaotic” is a judgment emerging from the perspective of the contemporary standard languages, with their prescriptive normalization of morphology, syntax and orthography. Not having a prescriptive standard to adhere to does not render these writers’ language chaotic.¹⁴

Similarly, Andrejčin (1978:19) judges the usage of renarrative forms in Sofronij’s and his contemporaries’ texts as not always being stylistically correct:

Ošte v istoričeskija razkaz na Paisij namira zakonното si mjesto preizkaznoto naklonenie na novobălgarskija ezik, koeto po-natatăk se srešta i u Sofronij [...] i u mnogo drugi văzroždenski avtori, makar i ne vinagi v pravilna stilistična upotreba v njakoi žanrove.

‘Already in Paisij’s historical narration the renarrative mode of the modern Bulgarian language finds its regular place, which later on can be found also with Sofronij and with many other renaissance authors, albeit not always in correct stylistical usage in some genres.’

However, one wonders what the stylistic norms should have been, given that at that time norms had not been developed yet, as Andrejčin (1978:19) himself emphasizes. Writers did not even strive for a common norm – *[v]seki knižovnik v zavisimost ot podgotovkata si, ot ezikovoto si čuvstvo i poznavane na ezikovata dejstvitelnost rešava sam kak da piše* ‘every scribe, depending on his education, his linguistic feel for language and acquaintance with linguistic reality, decides himself how to write’ (Cojnska 1979:23). Moreover, since for contemporary Bulgarian the status of the renarrative as a distinct grammatical category is not uncontroversial (Friedman 2003, Roth 1979), this kind of “back projection” seems highly problematic. Thus, given the examples cited in *Sections 4.1-4.4*, it might still be pure arbitrariness we are faced with. But, then, how to reconcile this arbitrariness with the emerging regularities observed by D’omina for earlier texts?

In what follows, it will be argued that the usage of the *l*-periphrasis by authors like Sofronij Vračanski and Pop Punčo is by no means arbitrary. On the contrary: it indicates the exploitation of the semantics of these forms on the text level against the background of an increasing freedom in literary styles and genres. In this sense, the usage encountered in the texts analyzed here can indeed be regarded as further development of what had started already in the damaskini. *Balkanistica* 29 (2016)

Sofronij Vračanski, Pop Punčo and others were well aware of the possibilities offered by the *l*-periphrasis and made conscious use of it, not only with regard to contexts or frequency of usage, but also with respect to the functional range of these forms.¹⁵

A first type of supportive context motivating the usage of -aux forms can be found in (20), above. *nyi ot tova nikoę vęstę ne imaxmi* ‘and we did not have any information about this’ in (20a) and *slędę tri dni razbraxę* ‘after three days I learned’ in (20b) indicate that the information conveyed does not relate to the personal witness of the first-person narrator, but comes from somebody else. This illustrates that the usage of -aux forms may be accompanied by a shift in perspective away from the narrator’s point of view. This in turn presupposes the possibility of viewpoint playing a role, *i.e.*, a narrator being visible in the text. That a narrator indeed starts playing a role in the composition of the texts can be seen from examples (24) and (25), which are both excerpts from Sofronij Vračanski’s *PE*:

- (24) Vtorij boj *napravitę* Konstantinę sę Vizantię (Carigradę) i kato *obladalę* Bęlgaria. *zelę* Vizantia i *prinesalę* svoętę stolninę otę Rimę vę Vizantia okolo 330 godiny podirę Xrista. i *narekalę* Vizantija Konstantinopolę na svoeto ime. Vę tyę vremena dodoxa na dunava Tataritę i Skititę. no carę Konstantinę i tęxę *pobędilę*, sę pomoštętę na čestnyę kręstę [...] (*PE*, 270).

‘The second war Konstantin *waged* with Byzantium (Tsarigrad) and *seized* Bulgaria. He *took* Byzantium and *transferred* his capital from Rome to Byzantium approximately 330 years after Christ. And he *called* Byzantium Constantinople, after his name. At that time, the Tatars and Scythians reached the Danube. But Tsar Konstantin *defeated* them as well, with the help of the true cross.’

- (25) I kato otidi tamo carica Elena vo vremeto na Makaria patriarxa *očistila* onęzi svęty męsta otę mręsnytę idoly. i mnogo mošti *iskopala* otę zemlętę. Poslę *sębrala* ierusalimskitę Evrei. i gi *pitala* da kaęatę, gđę e skritę čestnyę kręstę xristovę. a tę *kazali*: ne znaętę. Toga carica gi *zatvorila*, i kato *načnala* da gi męči i *rekla*: či šte gi pogubi sički, [...], tę sę uplašixa i

rekoxa: tuka ima edinъ starъ Evreinъ Iuda, kojto e synъ na ednogo proroka, toj može da ti kaže gdě e krъsta. No kato go *ispitvala* carica da ubadi krъsta. toj *rekalъ* či ne go znae (PE 270).

‘And when Tsaritsa Elena went there, at the time of patriarch Makarios, she *cleansed* those holy places of the odious idols. And she *excavated* many mortal remains. After that she *gathered* the Jews of Jerusalem. And *asked* them to tell where the true cross of Christ is hidden. And they *said*: they do not know. Then the tsaritsa *imprisoned* them and when she *began* to torture them and *said*: that she will destroy them, they became scared and said: here is an old Jew, Juda, who is the son of a prophet, he can tell you where to find the cross. But when the tsaritsa *wanted* him to disclose the cross, he *said* that he did not know it.’

For the -aux forms in (24) and (25) it would be hard to get a renarrative interpretation. Hints on the motivation for the usage of these forms can be derived from a comparative look at the *Vъzdiganieto na čestnyi krъstъ* in the *Svištovski*, *Koprištenski* and *Tixonravovski* damaskini, *i.e.*, the textual tradition within which to place these excerpts. The comparison reveals that the passage in (24) is inserted into the *PE* by Sofronij and that the excerpt in (25) is a very brief summary of a narration that takes much longer in all three Damaskini versions of the *Vъzdiganieto na čestnyi krъstъ*. This becomes apparent also from the reported speech passages (*a tě kazali: ne znaet; rekla: či šte gi pogubi sički; toj rekalъ či ne go zane*), which can be interpreted as summaries of the longer dialogues encountered in the damaskin version. Hence, the passages in (24) and (25) are to be ascribed to Sofronij and his conscious adaptation of the story according to the needs of his own textual intention. These passages indicate that he does not only appear as an author mentioning his own name (*e.g.*, *Azъ grěšnyj SOFRONIJ Episkopъ Vračanskij* ‘I, sinful Sofronij, bishop of Vraca,’ *PE*, 7), but he also introduces a narrating instance explicitly indicating that the stories are narrated and not simply told. Based on this assumption the quite consistent usage of aorist forms for “primary” liturgical texts (such as the Gospels) and -aux forms for “secondary” liturgical texts (such as instructions or exegeses, *i.e.*, *poučenija* and *tălkovanija*) in Sofronij Vračanski’s writings can be accounted for.

Balkanistica 29 (2016)

To further substantiate this claim, it is necessary to be more precise about “narrating” and to have a look at the literary development taking place during the time under consideration. This will be done in the next section, where it will be shown that literary development is one of the main factors conditioning the usage of -aux forms in written texts and their specific functions.

6. *Genre Development and l-Periphrasis*

The damaskini and the texts written in that tradition are important for the development of Balkan Slavic and the later standard languages not only from a linguistic point of view but also from a literary perspective. As Petkanova-Toteva (1965) and Petkanova (1992) point out, the literary development that started with the damaskini is characterized by an increase in liveliness, by emerging psychologization of characters and by the changing role of the *knižovnik*, who evolves from a translator or copyist into a narrator on his own right. These changes are usually analyzed at the level of narrative composition (a more prominent role of the characters in the text), the lexical level (the usage of psychological verbs to denote internal states of the acting characters) and by the fact that authors give short pieces of information about themselves (*azъ popa puno ot selo mokrešъ napisaxъ siju istoriju* ‘I, Pop Punčo from the village Mokreš, wrote this history,’ *Sbornik*, 354r) or explicitly address the audience (*się azъ usъrdno vamъ želju, i mene trudivšagosę proštenie: zdravstvujte* ‘this I wish you cordially, and me, being zealous, redemption: stay well,’ *PE*, VII, preface). In this context the question arises whether the usage of the *l*-periphrasis can be related to this development, and if so, why this should be the case. Answering both questions requires having a look at the semantics and the pragmatic potential of these forms.

As has already been pointed out in *Section 2*, the development of the *l*-periphrasis in Bulgarian and specific Macedonian dialects differs from that in the other Slavic languages insofar as the auxiliary variation in the third person has been preserved and has been functionally reinterpreted. This functional reinterpretation consists of the anchoring of the assertion of a state being connected to a prior event to an observing instance, thereby introducing a point of view. With the +aux forms, the assertion is anchored to the speaker’s time of utterance in dialogical settings, or the narrator’s time of utterance in non-dialogical contexts, such as subordination and narration (this fits Dickey’s 2013 observation on the “subjectification” of the auxiliary). With the -aux forms, the assertion is anchored

to a point of view that is not the narrator's but, for instance, that of a character in the text (cf. Sonnenhauser 2012 for a more detailed analysis).

This semantic characterization of the *l*-periphrasis provides the basis for a range of textual usage patterns and discourse-pragmatic interpretations which are all related to the introduction of points of view and the perspectival structuring of the text. This is visible in (26a), where the usage of *e reklb* and *reklb* can be explained by a difference in anchoring and hence in perspective: the +aux form *e reklb* anchors the assertion – the summary of what Malax has said – to the narrator, whereas the -aux form *reklb* indicates that it is summarized by the devil, *i.e.*, a character in the text. A similar effect can be observed for *rekalb* in (26b). Here, the usage of the -aux form anchors the indirect speech to the subject of the matrix clause, *i.e.*, *onezi bolěry*, and not to the narrator. Thereby, the auxiliary variation helps solve an ambiguity which is typical of indirect speech.

- (26) a. diabolъ razumě čto *e reklb* malxъ na ženъta si. i zavidě. i ište da i stori pakostъ [...] i reče ei. mužъ tvoj pusti me da te zavedu pri njego. a tia go ne věrova i ne šte da ide. a diabolъ ej kaza sičko čto i *reklb* mužъ jei, koga otxoždaše. ami i sega zatova me pusti pri tebě da te zavedu. a tia mu reče. istinu taka sme dumale (*Tixonravovski*, 77v-78r/114).

‘The devil understood what Malax *said* to his wife. And was envious. And wanted to do her harm and said to her. Your husband let me bring you to him. But she did not believe him and did not want to go. But the devil told her everything her husband *told* him, when she was leaving. And now, therefore, he let me bring you [to him]. And she told him: indeed, this is how we were talking.’

- b. I na utrě stana Valaamъ i reči na onezi bolěri: bogъ ma ne pušta da ida sъs vasъ. I utidoxa si onezy bolěry pri carě Valaaka i kazaxa mu, ka(kъ) imъ *rekalb* Valaamъ (*Svištovski*, 343/200).

‘And in the morning Valaam got up and told those boyars: God does not allow me to come with you. And those boyars went to Tsar Valaak and told him, as Valaam *told* them.’

That -aux forms anchor the narration to a character in the text and not to the narrator is also suggested by example (27) (= (4a), above), wherein the adverb *davno* can only refer to the subject of the matrix clause, but not to the narrator:

- (27) I taka se pom(o)li i naděeše se na b(og)a, *davno viděl* někogy
togova čl(ově)ka (*Trojanski*, 262/177).
'And so he prayed and hoped to God that somebody *might* have
seen that man.'

Based on the anchoring function of the *l*-forms, putative unsystematic uses can be explained as well, such as that in (7) above, repeated here as (28):

- (28) I pisanieto dumaše taka [...] I Theofilъ kato onia nepravedno
čini, i [...]. egiptъsky stolъ *priel*, a nepravedno čini [...]. i
za[ra]di tova *sъbral* se sъborъ sъs epsъkpy egyptъsky [...]. i
plakaaxu za Sidora [...]. deto go *e mučil* Theofilъ sъsěkakvy
muky (*Tixonravovski*, 114v/146).
'And the document said the following: and Theophil, he did this
without legal cause, he *took over* the Egyptian throne, and did
this without legal cause. And therefore a council *has gathered*
with the Egyptian bishops. And they cried over Isidor, whom
Theofil *has tortured* with all kinds of torment.'

Whereas the present and imperfect forms (*čini*, *směšjiuva se*, *xody*, *dosažda*, *plakaaxu*) give a description of the situation, the -aux forms narrate events from a perspective different from the narrator's, while the +aux form *e mučil* indicates the relevance of the torturing to the narrator's time of utterance. Example (28) also shows that the point of view specified by -aux forms may be left unspecified and be simply that of some "non-narrator's." In any case, the narrator is backgrounded the narration foregrounded, as has been pointed out already by Fielder (1995). In this way, -aux-forms can be used to convey a sequence of events as in (28), above, and to elaborate on some event in more detail. An example of this latter usage is given in (29). Here, the main event is the throwing of the monk into the sea (*metnuxago umoreto*). The +aux form *e bilo* indicates that the narrator steps in and locates this event in context, before it is elaborated on in more detail by the -aux forms *otpeli*, *izlezli*, *zatrovili* and *utišli*. That this is indeed an elaboration is also

suggested by the continuance with *onja momkь padnu umoreto*, which with *onja momkь* anaphorically refers to the object participant of the previous event (*go*) and repeats this event by means of *padnu umoreto*, thereby regressing to the main story line:

- (29) i metnuxago xudno umoreto i tovae *bilo* ot večerь koti *otpeli* duxovnici večernja *izlezli izmanastirь* i *zatrovili* vratata pasi *utišli* u kelij kogi onja momkь padnu xudno umoreto (*Sbornik*, 24v).
 ‘and they threw him into the sea and this was in the evening when the clergymen *prayed* their evening prayer, *left* the monastery and *closed* the doors and *went* to their cells, when this monk fell into the sea.’

Since +aux forms anchor the assertion to the narrator, their main domain of usage are dialogues and subordinate clauses. Because of the foregrounding of the narrating event, they typically appear in comments by the narrator, as has already been indicated by *e bylo* in (29). Two more examples are given in (30). Both forms appear in the introductory parts to the subsequent stories and are used by the narrator to establish the basis for the story to be elaborated on:

- (30) a. naši bratija da vi kažeme kakvo *e dumalь* ioanь prdča (*Sbornik*, 48v).
 ‘Our brothers, let us tell you what prophet John *has said*.’
 b. Blǵosloveni · xrstijani · poslušajte daskažeme čudesа što se *e pravilo* [...] daže ido dnešni · denь (*Sbornik*, 22v).
 ‘Blessed Christians, listen that we can tell you the wonders that *have been done* even until today.’

Through the usage of the auxiliary, *e dumal* in (30a) and *e pravilo* in (30b) are related to the narrator, as is typical of “off-plotline sections” in the sense of Fludernik (1991:373), *i.e.*, of “embedded orientation and commentary” in which “the tenses relates [sic] directly to the narrator’s present moment of discourse.” By this distinction between main story line and off-plotline commentaries, “a double-

tiered structure of ongoing story and simultaneous commentary and explanation” is marked (*Ibid.*:377).

In Balkan Slavic, this double-tiered structure can be morphologically reflected in terms of the auxiliary variation, indicating the point of view to which the narration is anchored. This may be the narrator (+aux), as in (30), or some non-narrator, such as a character in the text (-aux). The latter accounts for the possible renarrative or non-witnessed interpretations of -aux forms, as in (20). It also allows for the explicit de-anchoring of the narration from the narrator, which is basic to the usage of *štelb da umre* and *kazalb* in (31) (=5b):

- (31) zašto ako kažete to šte da se razvali zakonb ot oči naši předanie, sirče, što sb naučile i utvrđile. žašto dědb moi zakxei, koga štelb da umre, i kazalb oču moemu simonu (*Tixonravovski*, 23/65).

‘Because if you tell it the law of the tradition of our fathers will get ruined, that is, what they have learnt and decreed. Because my grandfather Zakxej, when he *was about to die*, told [it] my father Simon. And my father told me [this] and advised me.’

By the introduction of viewpoints, the *l*-perfect differs from other perfect constructions, such as the *ima*-perfect. This form has been spreading from Western Balkan Slavic and has developed into a typical perfect in some Macedonian dialects, whereas in other parts of Balkan Slavic it is still restricted in terms of its verbal basis, *e.g.*, restricted to transitive verbs. Some rare occurrences of the *ima*-perfect can be observed in texts dating to the time span under investigation in this article. Examples such as (32) illustrate the impersonal and statal character of this type of perfect, which asserts the result of a previous event (here, something written, something buried and somebody kept imprisoned, respectively) being on hand in the current situation (*cf.* Fielder 1996 on the development of the *ima*-perfect):

- (32) a. I slušaj čto *ima pisano* vъ kniga proroku zaxariju (*Trojanski*, 73/57)
‘And listen what *is written* in the book of the Prophet Zachary.’

- b. edinъ zemledělecъ, kato umiraše, reče na synove-tě si, či
ima zakpano imenie vъ lozie-to (RB, 56).
 ‘a landowner, when he was about to die, said to his sons that
 there *are* valuables *buried* in his vineyard.’
- c. i togazy na skoru pusti povelěnie po sička zemla, gdeto *ima*
xristiane zatvoreny vъ temnicu (Koprištenski, 214/88).
 ‘and he sent out a decree all over the world, where
 Christians *are kept imprisoned*.’

The aorist and imperfect differ from *l*-forms in that they do not introduce any point of view, but present the plain sequence of events. They are thus typical of mimetic texts, whereas *l*-forms are indicative of the narrative text type, which is characterized by the explicit presence of a narrating instance (Schmid 2008, Sonnenhauser 2012). Given this correlation between verb form and text type, the increase in usage of *l*-periphrases can be related to the increasing literary freedom. The development of new genres is characterized by the possibility of presenting narration, *i.e.*, explicitly relating the processual layer of narration and the static layer of what is narrated (Sonnenhauser 2014a), as manifested in genres such as *tălkovanija* and *poučenija*.

The feature of narrativity being morphologically reflected in the usage of the *l*-forms opens up the possibility of choosing between different ways of presenting one and the same story: in a mimetic, aorist-based way, or in a narrative, *l*-form way (note that D’omina also speaks of a choice with respect to the Balkan manner of narration; *cf. Section 3.3*). This also accounts for the differences pointed out in *Sections 4.3* and *4.4*. Using *l*-forms or aorists marks a difference in text type; it is not *per se* conditioned by time, author or subject matter. And it is not *per se* related to renarration. The decisive factor conditioning the usage of forms is the text type chosen by the author. This text type in turn is typically in line with the intention of the text and its discourse tradition. In the examples analyzed here, the basic intention is that of interpretation and explanation – a *tălkovanie* or a *poučenie* – of a biblical text. The indication of the position of the interpreting instance – the narrative instance – being crucial for these intentions, the *l*-forms are a better choice to meet these requirements than aorist forms. Instead of being random and arbitrary, the usage of *l*-forms turns out to adhere to the textual intentions of the

new genres evolving in the course of this development (*cf.* Henninger 1987:39 for a similar observation).

7. Conclusion: The “Balkan Manner of Narration”

The preceding discussion has revealed remarkable convergences in the (non-)usage of the *l*-periphrasis in the text investigated, even though this usage might not in any case comply with the contemporary prescriptive standard. By introducing an observer’s point of view and hence a narrating instance, the *l*-forms provide a choice between different ways of rendering the subject matter: in a mimetic or a narrative style, *i.e.*, in terms of a plain sequencing of events or in terms of a mediated presentation of events. The latter possibility corresponds to what D’omina (1970:418-19) calls *bălgarskija arxetip manier na povestvovanie* ‘the Bulgarian archetypical manner of narration’ – a specific interaction of morphology and textual intention. There is no external criterion necessitating this way of telling a story: neither language-internal development, nor subject matter nor the author’s dialectal background and personal preferences have turned out to be decisive factors influencing the choice of forms. What has turned out decisive instead are the author’s intentions concerning the way of presenting his story, according to the purpose of the text, facilitated by the newly-developing genres. Depending on that intention, the author may decide to introduce a narrating instance or not and hence choose *l*-forms (+/–aux) or aorist/imperfect/present tense forms.

The convergences across authors concerning this relation between choice of forms and textual intention is striking all the more so as during the period investigated in this article no efforts toward the establishment of a common norm can be found.¹⁶ It is this usage of the specific functional potential provided by the *l*-forms on the text level, *i.e.*, the introduction of points of view and the explicit perspectival anchoring of the narration, that can be called the Balkan manner of narration. It is by no means obligatory, but it is one additional possibility of shaping narration. That this Balkan manner of narration is found on the linguistic level also complies with what Georges (1972:329-30) has observed for the level of content-structuring: the Balkan text is characterized not so much by a specific “story-tradition” but by a “story-telling tradition,” *i.e.*, the specific way in which texts are presented.

What has also become evident is the relevance of discourse traditions in accounting for the usage and interpretation of specific forms. It has been shown

that for the interpretation of -aux forms, instead of being fixed as renarrative, non-witnessed and the like, they have different interpretations in different texts: they tend to receive a renarrative or non-witnessed interpretation in the *Žitie*, a first-person narration, whereas in secondary liturgical texts, *i.e.*, *tǎlkovanija* and *poučenija*, they mark the de-anchoring of narration from a narrator. In primary liturgical texts (mainly the Gospels) and in the *damaskini* they are often used to mark deviations from the main story line. This conforms to what studies in discourse and genre traditions have emphasized, namely, that depending on the discourse tradition, one and the same linguistic entity may have different functions (Rosemeyer 2014), and that one and the same linguistic form may require different sociolinguistic interpretations, depending on the discourse tradition (Wilhelm 2001:474).¹⁷

Thus, in order to provide a satisfying account of the usage of specific linguistic forms, discourse tradition emerges as an additional factor to be taken into account (*Ibid.*:474). This does not mean that a semantic analysis becomes superfluous. Quite to the contrary, it is only based on a thorough semantic analysis that the different functions and interpretations of one and the same form and its interactions with the textual environment can be explained.

Notes

1. The research for this paper has been supported by the *Fonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung* FWF (Project “On the Emergence of Narrativity in Early Neo-Balkan Slavic,” project number M1536-G23). This support is gratefully acknowledged. I would also like to thank an anonymous *Balkanistica* reviewer for his or her valuable comments.
2. Cf. Ivančev (1978) and Fielder (2002/2003) for possible reconstructions of this process.
3. The situation for Macedonian is more complex, in that its eastern varieties resemble Torlak, while southwestern Macedonian gradually loses the *l*-participle (see Friedman 1988 for a concise description of the relevant morphological and semantic isoglosses).
4. Here and in the examples below, the first number gives the list in the manuscript, the second the page in the edition.
5. This is similar to what Trummer (1971) observes for Middle Bulgarian texts from the 14th to 16th century.
6. Orthography and punctuation follow the editions or manuscripts. The nasals are transliterated as *ę* and *ǫ*, respectively.

7. Note that the “double” -aux form *byl obyčalъ* is not dubitative, as might be suspected from a contemporary perspective.

8. Note that the events are presented in a slightly different way than in the *Trojanski* and the *Koprištenski* damaskini: what is described here is the informing of the people by the woman and the man who had the same dream before her, not the order to do so.

9. This pertains to the group of narrations conveying the lives of the saints, since only here are these forms being used. Narrations concerning religious events are mainly rendered in the present tense, instructions in the present tense and the imperative (D’omina 1970:416).

10. There is one caveat which has to be kept in mind in particular as concerns *Section 4.3.2*: As I found out after this article had been accepted for publication (thanks to Jürgen Fuchsbaier for pointing this out to me), it is not quite clear whether the *Poučitelno evangelie*, which gives 1806 as its date of composition, but was printed only in 1868, is indeed composed by Sofronij Vračanski (as indicated on the title page) or rather it represents an edited version (by an unknown editor) of his *Nedelnik* ‘Sunday Book.’ Both exhibit differences in content, the texts included, and structure *i.e.*, the sequences of *evangelie* passages and explanations/instructions (which appear after the *evangelie* passages in the *PE*, but are inserted in those passages in the *Nedelnik*). While it is conceivable that both texts trace back to the same source, whether – and if so, how – both are related to each other is a matter for further philological research.

11. This is, of course, not to deny that they may be part of a larger textological tradition. Notably, this pertains to sermons, liturgical texts and vitae. However, Pop Punčo’s and Sofronij Vračanski’s versions are not mere copies of the corresponding texts in the damaskini, but rather re-tellings (*cf.* the comments on (24) and (25), below) including abbreviations and amendments.

12. The passage left out is missing in the *Sbornik*.

13. According to Gyllin (1991:85), Paisij’s language is neither consistently vernacular nor consistently Church Slavonic. This leads him to conclude that the *Istorija* “is quite likely to be the worst mishmash that any Bulgarian text of the whole 18th century can present” (*Ibid.*). It “shows a considerable agreement with Old Bulgarian/Church Slavonic. In fact it shows a far stronger affinity to Old Bulgarian/Church Slavonic grammatical structure and a far lesser affinity to vernacular New Bulgarian (and thus to modern literary Bulgarian) grammatical structure than do the 17th century damascenes” (Gyllin 1991:83).

14. Their usage of spatiae, for instance, is at least as “logical” as the contemporary standard: word segmentation was then based on phonological words, *e.g.*, *isrečnaxugo* (*i.e.*, *i srečnaxu go*) and *idadei* (*i.e.*, *i dade i*) in (14), or *metnaxugo* (*i.e.*, *metnaxu go*) in (29). This holds for the manuscripts (*e.g.*, *Sbornik*), while in printed books (*e.g.*, *PE*), segmentation is predominantly lexeme-based. This may have its reasons in the technical affordances of printing.

15. For Sofronij's writings, this can be observed in other respects as well, *e.g.*, his usage of *če* and *kako* as factive complementizers (Sonnenhauser 2014c).
16. The picture concerning phonological, lexical and morphosyntactic levels was far from homogeneous at that time; Djulgarova and Miklas (2007:117) call it "jagged."
17. This is apparent also in the discussion of the usage of renarrative forms in contemporary journalistic prose in Bulgarian, which is commonly regarded as stylistically inappropriate (Nicolova 2001, Comati 2005). Since this usage predominates in specific newspapers and specific genres (*krimi i pravo*), one may equally well argue that the usage of these forms is typical of these newly-emerging genres (as suggested in Sonnenhauser 2014b).

References

- Andrejčin, Ljubomir. 1968. "Razkazvatelnite naklonenija v proizvedenijata na Sofronij Vračanski," *Slavističen sbornik. Po slučaj VI Meždunaroden kongres na slavistite v Praga*. Sofija, pp. 139-44.
- _____. 1978. "Uvod: Njakoi vāprosi okolo izgraždaneto i razvoja na bălgarskija knižoven ezik," *Hristomatija po istorija na novobălgarskija knižoven ezik*, Andrejčin, L. (red.). Sofija: Nauka i izkustvo, pp. 5-23.
- Angelov, Bonju. 1958. *Iz starata bălgarska, ruska i srăbska literatura*. Sofija: Izdatelstvo na Bălgarskata Akademija na Naukite.
- _____. 1964. *Săvremennici na Paisij II*. Sofija: Izdatelstvo na Bălgarskata Akademija na Naukite.
- Asenova, Petja. 2002. *Balkansko ezikoznanie. Osnovni problemi na balkanskija ezikov săjuz*. Sofija: Faber.
- Cojnska, Ralica. 1979. *Ezikăt na Joakim Kărčovski*. Sofija: Bălgarska Akademija na Naukite.
- Comati, Sigrun. 2005. "Die Sprache der heutigen bulgarischen Printmedien. Ein Blick in die Medienlandschaft Bulgariens," *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 41(1), pp. 1-14.
- D'omina, Evgenija I. 1970. "Kăm istorijata na modalnite kategorii na bălgarskija glagol," *Bălgarski ezik* 20(5), pp. 405-21.
- Demina, Evgenija I. 1960. "Sistema prošedšix vremen v novobolgarskix tekstax XVII-XVIII vekov," *Učenie zapiski instituta slavjanovedenija* 19, pp. 3-48.
- Dickey, Stephen. 2013. "See, Now They Vanish: Third-Person Perfect Auxiliaries in Old and Middle Czech," *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 21(1), pp. 77-121.

- Djulgerova, Maria, and Heinz Miklas. 2007. "Die Sprache als Institution einer heranwachsenden Gesellschaft: Zur Entwicklung des bulgarischen Zivilisationswortschatzes im 19. Jahrhundert," *Herrschaft, Staat und Gesellschaft in Südosteuropa aus sprach- und kulturhistorischer Sicht. Erneuerung des Zivilisationswortschatzes im 19. Jahrhundert. Akten des Internationalen Symposiums 2.-3. März 2006*, Neweklowsky, Gerhard (ed.). Wien: VÖAW, pp. 115-77.
- Fielder, Grace. 1995. "Narrative Perspective and the Bulgarian *l*-participle. *Slavic and East European Journal* 39(4), pp. 585-600.
- _____. 1996. "The Relationship between the *ima* ('have') Perfect, the *sum* ('be') Perfect and Auxiliary Loss in Macedonian and Bulgarian," *Studii za makedonskiot jazik, literatura i kultur*. Skopje: Univerzitet "Sveti Kiril i Metodij," pp. 177-85.
- _____. 1999. "Development of Narrative Strategies in Nineteenth Century East Balkan Slavic Prose," *In the Realm of Slavic Philology: To Honor the Teachings and Scholarship of Dean S. Worth from His UCLA Students*, Dingley, J., and L. Ferder (eds). Bloomington, IN: Slavica, pp. 87-195.
- _____. 2002/2003. "A Phoenix from the Ashes. The Resurrection of the Bulgarian Perfect," *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 44-45, pp. 109-27.
- Fludernik, Monika. 1991. "The Historical Present Tense Yet Again. Tense Switching and Narrative Dynamics in Oral and Quasi-Oral Storytelling," *Text* 11, pp. 365-98.
- Friedman, Victor A. 1988. "Morphological Innovation and Semantic Shift in Macedonian," *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 24(1), pp. 34-41.
- _____. 1994. "Variation and Grammaticalization in the Development of Balkanisms," *CLS 30 Papers from the 30th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, Volume 2: The Parasession on Variation in Linguistic Theory*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, pp. 101-15.
- _____. 2003. "Evidentialis in Balkan Slavic, Albanian and Turkish," *Turkish in Macedonia and Beyond*, Friedman, A. (ed.). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, pp. 84-111.
- _____. 2006. "Balkans as a Linguistic Area," *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics, Volume 1*, Brown, Keith (ed.). Oxford: Elsevier, pp. 657-72.

- _____. 2012. "Balkan Epic Cyclicity: A View from the Languages," *Balkan Epic. Song, History, Modernity*, Bohlmann, P., and N. Petković (eds). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, pp. 293-309.
- Georges, Robert A. 1972. "Process and Structure in Traditional Storytelling in the Balkans: Some Preliminary Remarks," *Aspects of the Balkans. Continuity and Change*, Birnbaum, Henrich, and Speros Vryonis (eds). The Hague, Paris: Mouton, pp. 319-37.
- Grickat, Irena. 1954. *O perfektu bez pomoćnog glagola u srpskohrvatskom jeziku i srodnim sintaksičkim pojavama*. Beograd: Naučna Knjiga.
- Gyllin, R. 1991. *The Genesis of the Modern Bulgarian Literary Language*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- Henninger, Thomas. 1987. *Balkanische Lexik im Schrifttum der bulgarischen Wiedergeburt*. Neuried: Hieronymus.
- Hill, P. 1992. "Language Standardization in the South Slavonic Area," *Sociolinguistica* 6, pp. 108-50
- Ivančev, Svetomir. 1978[1976]. "Problemi na razvitiето i funkcioniraneto na modalnite kategorii v bālgarskija ezik," *Prinosi v bālgarskoto i slavjanskoto ezikoznanie*. Sofija: Bālgarska Akademija na Naukite, pp. 80-91.
- Meermann, Anastasia. 2015. "Truncated Perfect in Serbian – A Distance Marker? *Distance in Language: Grounding a Metaphor*, Sonnenhauser, B., and A. Meermann (eds). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 95-116.
- Mladenova, Olga. 2007. "A Pilot Project in Bulgarian Historical Dialectology: Dialect Attribution of the Trojan Damaskin," *Linguistique Balkanique* XLVI/2-3, pp. 145-66.
- Moser, Charles A. 1972. *A History of Bulgarian Literature, 865-1944*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton.
- Ničeva, Ketii. 1965. *Ezikāt na sofronievija "Nedelnik" v istorijata na bālgarskija knižoven ezik*. Sofija: Bālgarska Akademija na Naukite
- Nicolova, Ruselina. 2001. "Grammatische Veränderungen in der Sprache der bulgarischen Presse in der letzten Dekade des 20. Jahrhunderts," *Die Sprachen Südosteuropas heute. Umbrüche und Aufbrüche*, Kunzmann-Müller, Barbara. (ed.). Frankfurt am Main et al.: Petere Lang, pp. 15-30.
- _____. 2008. *Bālgarska gramatika. Morfologija*. Sofija: Sv. Kliment Ohridski.
- Petakanova, Donka. 1992. *Starobālgarska literatura IX-XVIII vek*. Sofija: Sv. Kliment Ohridski.

- Petkanova-Toteva, Donka. 1965. *Damaskinite v bālgarskata literatura*. Sofija: Bālgarska Akademija na Naukite.
- Rosemeyer, Malte. 2014. "Entrenchment and Discourse Traditions in Spanish Auxiliary Selection," *Auxiliary Selection Revisited: Gradience and Gradualness*, Kailuweit, Rolf, and Malte Rosemeyer (eds). Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.
- Roth, Juliane. 1979. *Die indirekten Erlebnisformen im Bulgarischen. Eine Untersuchung zu ihrem Gebrauch in der Umgangssprache*. München: Sagner.
- Rusinov, Rusin. 1999. *Istorija na novobālgarskija knižoven ezik*. Veliko Tārnovo: Abagar.
- Sadnik, Linda. 1966. "Der Ersatz von Aorist und Imperfekt durch die *l*-Periphrase, namentlich im Russischen," *Anzeiger für slavische Philologie* 1, pp. 16-30.
- Schmid, Wolf. 2008. *Elemente der Narratologie*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.
- Schooneveld, Claus van. 1959. *A Semantic Analysis of the Old Russian Finite Preterite System*. 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton and Co.
- Sonnenhauser, Barbara. 2012. "Auxiliar-Variation und Textstruktur im Bulgarischen," *Die Welt der Slaven* 57(2), pp. 351-79.
- _____. 2014a (to appear). "Presenting Narration. The Perspectival Construction of Narrativity in Bulgarian and Macedonian," *Basic Principles of Narrativity: Perspectives and Perspectivization in Language, Picture, Music*, Igl, Natalia, and Sonja Zeman (eds). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- _____. 2014b. "Erzählen im Bulgarischen zwischen Texttyp und Genre. Pressebericht und Evangelium," *Krimi i pravo und Tālkovanie. Die Welt der Slaven* 59(2), pp. 355-81.
- _____. 2014c. "Point of View in Pre-Standardized Balkan Slavic Vernacular Narration: A Discourse-Diachronic Perspective," paper presented at the 13th Annual Conference of the Slavic Cognitive Linguistics Association (SCLC-2014), Harvard University.
- Taube, Moshe. 1980. "On the Penetration of the Perfect into the Russian Narrative System," *Russian Linguistics* 5, pp. 121-31
- Trost, Klaus. 1972. *Perfekt und Konditional im Altkirchenslavischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Trummer, Manfred. 1971. "Zur Entwicklung der *l*-Periphrase im Bulgarischen," *Anzeiger für slavische Philologie* 5, pp. 1-65
- Vātov, Vārvan. 2001. *Ezikāt na Sofronij Vračanski*. Veliko Tārnovo: Faber.

Wilhelm, Raymund. 2001. "Diskurstraditionen," *Language Typology and Language Universals. An International Handbook. Volume 1*, Haspelmath, Martin, et al. (eds). Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, pp. 467-77.

Text Sources

Koprištenski = Miletičъ, L. 1908. *Koprištenski damaskinъ. Novobălgarski pametnikъ otъ XVII. vĕkъ*. Sofija: Ministerstvo na Narodnata Prosvĕta.

Ljubljanski = Argirovъ, S. 1895. *Ljubljanskijatъ bălgarski rokopoъ otъ XVII vĕkъ. Sbornikъ za narodni umotvorenija, nauka i knižnina XII*, 463-560 .

Nedelnik = Sofronij Vračanskij. *Nedelnik*. 1806 (available on line at: [<http://dl.wdl.org/273/service/273.pdf>]).

PE = Sofronij Vračanskij. *Poučitelno Evangelie*. 1806 (printed in 1868) (available on line at: [<http://www.nationallibrary.bg/cgi-bin/e-cms/vis/vis.pl?s=001&p=0038&n=&vis=>]).

RB = 1824. *Bukvarъ sъ različny poučenę sobrani ot Petra H. Beroviča za Bolgarskitĕ učilištę*.

Sbornik = *Pop Punčov Sbornik*. 1796. (available on line at: [<http://www.nationallibrary.bg/cgi-bin/e-cms/vis/vis.pl?s=001&p=0038&n=&vis=>]).

Svištovski = Miletičъ, L. 1923. *Svištovski damaskinъ. Novobălgarski pametnikъ otъ XVIII. vĕkъ*. Sofija: Bălgarska Akademija na Naukite.

Tixonravovski: Demina, E.I. 1971. *Tixonravovskij damaskin. Bolgarskij pamjatnik XVIIv. Issledovanie i tekst*. Sofija: Bălgarska Akademija na Naukite.

Trojanski = Trojanski, Ivanova A. 1967. *Trojanski damaskin. Bălgarski pametnik otъ XVII vek*. Sofija: Bălgarska Akademija na Naukite.

Žitie: Dylevskij, N.M., and A.N. Robinson (eds). 1976. *Sofronij Vračanskij. Žizneopisanie*. Leningrad: Nauka.